

Appln No. 10/760,222  
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2005  
Response to Office Action of December 27, 2005

6

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated December 27, 2005. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

#### **Amendments**

The description has been amended throughout to address typographical errors and obvious mistakes that have come to light upon review of the specification.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

#### **35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1 to 3**

Claims 1 to 3 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,439,908 to Silverbrook et al. The Applicant disagrees.

The '908 patent describes a printer with a modular pagewidth printhead. The printhead has 10 separate modules that are individually replaceable. Should nozzle failure from one module cause artifacts in the print, it can be replaced rather than replacing an entire pagewidth printhead chip.

The pagewidth printhead assembly 10 is not a cartridge. It is permanently mounted in the printer body. Only the individual modules 12 are replaceable.

In contrast, the present invention is a cartridge with two print chips for use in a printer. The entire cartridge, including the print chips and ink storage, is removable and replaceable. Using two print chips in the cartridge allows a pagewidth design that has a simple and reliable electrical interface with the printer controller. Two print chips allow the interface for each chip to be at either end of the printhead. The number of electrical contacts is divided between the interfaces at each end and the compressive force aligned down the longitudinal axis of the printhead maintains the connection between the contacts and secures the cartridge into position. The '908 printhead is not a component of a removable cartridge and comprises ten separate printhead modules.

Accordingly, the cited reference does not teach a fundamental element of the present invention and therefore fails to anticipate any of claims 1 to 3.

#### **35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 4**

Claim 4 stands rejected as obvious in light of '908 in view of US 6,722,759 to Torgerson. It follows from the above submissions in relation to §102, that the combined disclosures of the cited references fail to teach the combination of elements defined by claim 4. Accordingly, the cited references do not support a rejection under §103.

Appln No. 10/760,222  
Amdt. Dated February 15, 2005  
Response to Office Action of December 27, 2005

7

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,  
Applicant:



---

KIS SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762